

**Persecution by Federal Communications
Commission**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, in a very definite and emphatic manner, I called the attention of this House to my serious concern, as a person of Italian ancestry, to the action of the Federal Communications Commission in relying upon and vouching for—as a star witness—an intolerant and misinformed man by the name of Clete Roberts, who asserted that “no Italian south of Rome”—that no Italian out of 20,000,000 people—“was worth a tinker's damn; that they were all lazy and indolent, that they wanted the United States to feed them and think for them, and that none of these Italians would even say ‘thank you’ for the favors they received from our country.”

As I stated then, I am more than proud that my own ancestors came from the southern part of Italy, and I know that other Members of this House who are of Italian ancestry are just as proud of this as I am. I resented these slurs and I know that all fair-minded Americans resent them.

I have sought to learn from the Federal Communications Commission whether it is its intention to continue to vouch for and support as worthy of credibility this particular witness who not only makes such ill-founded charges against the people of the south of Italy but who, while on the witness stand as an alleged star witness for the Federal Communications Commission, refused to apologize for these remarks or even to change them. In fact, this man Roberts contended that they were true and that he would stand by them. To my amazement, Mr. Speaker, and Members of this House, it appears that the Federal Communications Commission intends to use this particular witness again as one of its star performers. May I report that I have examined the record of his testimony and find that on cross examination he admitted that he had been fired from every good job he ever had, that he took papers and files from his employer's station without permission and refused to return them until subpoenaed, that he intentionally disobeyed his employer's instructions behind his employer's back, hoping that he would not learn about these serious violations of employer-employee relationship. Furthermore, this alleged star witness, Roberts, admitted that he had been secretly on the payroll of an automobile promoter who has been indicted for grand larceny, and that while on this man's payroll he had engaged in promotional efforts to obtain money for the sale of auto franchises—these promotion efforts consisting in part of a pretense of an on-the-spot report of events as they

were supposed to be seen, heard, and reported by a top radio reporter. The fact of the matter is that this promotional program, along with the questions and answers, were arranged beforehand with studied effort and intention to create this false impression that the public was listening to the noises of a busy automobile factory, when in truth and in fact the noises they heard had nothing to do with automobile production and were produced by banging on pipes with hammers to create this dishonest impression.

That such a witness cannot be worthy of belief was so obvious to me that I ask why does the Federal Communications Commission want to use such a man at all? What is involved in this particular proceeding that the Government of the United States should rely upon such a contemptible witness? As my statement of May 3 shows, I refer to the proceedings of the Federal Communications Commission against radio stations WJR of Detroit, WGAR of Cleveland, and KMPC of Los Angeles—the principal stockholder of these three outstanding stations being Mr. George A. Richards. In this instant proceeding the Commission is attempting to not renew the licenses of these three stations on the allegation that the news was “slanted.”

With regard to this particular case, the opening statement of Hugh Fulton, the attorney for these radio stations, was sent to me and every Member of the Congress by order of the American Legion of the State of Michigan with the suggestion of the American Legion that it involved vitally important issues that should be known to every one of us here with the possible expectancy that Congress would want to investigate this particular governmental agency and its handling of this matter.

These radio stations have a long record of achievement and acceptance and support from the public. They are stations which for many years have been heard by tens of millions of people. Several former employees of one of these stations, including this contemptible defamer, have contended that Mr. Richards expressed opinions concerning phonetic questions and racial issues, and it is apparently the present position of the Federal Communications Commission that it is entitled to pry into the very private thoughts and utterances of Mr. Richards as testified to by former, and discharged, employees. It is on this basis that the Federal Communications Commission hopes to deprive these radio stations of their licenses, with complete disregard of the public acceptance and approval of these same stations which have been established over a period of many years. This is what Mr. Fulton characterized as “thought control” and this is what the American Legion is opposed to, especially as these stations have been in the very forefront of the fight against communism and have had a long record of support of principles and policies of the American Legion and other organizations determined to fight for the preservation of our American ideals.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to believe in the American people. I do not believe that they are so stupid that they cannot determine for themselves whether they agree with or resent any discrimination or biased remarks they hear in radio presentation of the news. Our vast listening audiences read newspapers and hear various radio presentations of the same news constantly, and they can be trusted to understand and to compare what they see and hear and judge for themselves. I do not believe that they require any agency in Washington to do their thinking for them. I do not believe that they approve of any agency in Washington snooping around among discharged employees for alleged private remarks, and I am sure that neither they nor we approve of a waste of the taxpayers' money.

I am very emphatic when I say that this type of proceeding should never have been brought, and that it does constitute an attempt on the part of the Federal Communications Commission to usurp to itself the power of censorship which this Congress expressly banned it from exercising. I consider it an unwarranted waste of money and time of the Federal employees and of the personnel of these stations to go into these matters which raise these most serious questions. It would seem to me that the Federal Communications Commission actually intends to usurp the power of censorship and thought control. It appears that they are trying to persecute and punish a station owner who has dared to have his own private opinions. If successful in this case, what other radio stations are marked for attack? Where will this censorship axe fall next? As an American citizen, and a Democrat, I believe that everyone should be given a statement of the charges against him and an opportunity to defend himself. My investigation into this particular case shows a denial of these essential rights. The Federal Communications Commission not only refused to furnish a statement of the charges against these radio stations, but has fought tooth and nail to prevent the facts from coming to light. All of our radio stations should be judged by what goes on over the radio and not by what some discharged former employee contends an owner would like to have had go out over the radio. Yet, in this particular case, the Federal Communications Commission refuses to admit that the newscast scripts of what was broadcast should be received in evidence, although these newscast scripts have been in its possession for months and have been photostated. Going further in this case, the Federal Communications Commission has even sought to prevent its own witnesses from being asked to authenticate the scripts which they themselves had prepared. One of the very interesting and pertinent activities of the Federal Communications Commission in this particular case is that after it had spent 2 years investigating this matter, which investigations proving to them that these stations were great radio stations, it not only refrained from introducing the evidence it knew existed in favor of these stations, in-

cluding the testimony of persons who have told the Federal Communications Commission that their charges were false, but it even refused to stipulate that the general programing of these stations was good and that these stations enjoyed the highest reputation in their respective communities for public service and good programing.

What is the situation now? After 2 years of suffering from the innuendos and inferences from the charges of these former employees, these stations had expected to have at least an opportunity of proving the facts which the Federal Communications Commission's own investigations should have caused it to produce for that purpose. More than 100 witnesses were prepared to testify on behalf of Station KMPC in Los Angeles. Many of them had made special plans to arrange their time and some of them had arranged to go abroad. I am now advised that the chief counsel for Federal Communications Commission insists that it was improper for the station to present these witnesses at this time, and this position from the counsel for the Federal Communications Commission after its own examiner, charged by the Commission with the duty of regulating and conducting the proceedings in Los Angeles had heard extensive oral argument from both sides and had denied this application of the Commission's counsel. At this point the Federal Communications Commission itself, here in Washington, reached out and interfered with these proceedings in Los Angeles by ordering a nine-day adjournment. This occurred despite the fact that counsel for the Commission had asked its examiner to adjourn the proceedings to permit such an appeal and had been refused such an adjournment; and this occurred despite the fact that the Federal Communications Commission in Washington did not know and did not have before it the oral argument and the facts which their own examiner had before him in Los Angeles.

Many of the witnesses for this station, some of them busy and important public officials, were in court on Monday morning, June 5, to testify for this station but their time was wasted. Some of them had very important personal plans that should not have been interfered with. As an example, the Reverend John J. Cavanaugh, president of the University of Notre Dame, had prepared to fly from Notre Dame to Los Angeles to testify for the station and has now notified the station that his religious and official commitments are such that it will now be impossible for him to testify until after his return from the holy pilgrimage to Europe.

I, for one, want to make it clear on the record that I thoroughly and completely disagree with the Federal Communications Commission in its handling of this matter. I know that it has been publicly and silently criticized by a number of the Republican Members of this Congress who see in these efforts of the Commission a possibility of censorship of thought control disadvantageous to them. I also wish to join with my colleague from Ohio, the Honorable STEPHEN

YOUNG, who so ably pointed out on the floor of this House the other day that we Democrats are just as much opposed to this kind of ubiquitous interference as are the Republicans, and that we are just as much apt to be the victims of it, and that we are just as quick to protest it and to do all in our power to stop it. I would also like this record to show that I have personally contacted the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the Honorable SCOTT LUCAS, so that he would become familiar with the present machinations of the Federal Communications Commission in this case. As a party we should recognize the fact that the Italian-American groups throughout this country are alerted to the defamatory and ill-founded testimony of the witness Roberts whom I have referred to many times. Italian-American newspapers have already picked this up, and if this man Roberts is continued to be sponsored and supported by the Federal Communications Commission, we have very definitely not heard the end of it. In conclusion I want to heartily endorse the suggestion of Honorable STEPHEN YOUNG, Democratic Representative at Large from the State of Ohio, that the Speaker designate a committee of both Republicans and Democrats to confer with the Federal Communications Commission immediately and make a full report to this body as to the outcome of such a meeting.

Mme. Sun Finds Chinese Communists Are Not What She, Along With Snow, Lattimore, Fairbanks, and Company Portrayed Them To Be

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Tribune of June 10, 1950:

ECLIPSE OF MME. SUN

The lot of the fellow traveler, once communism comes to power, is not always easy. Take the case of Mme. Sun Yat-sen, widow of China's revolutionary leader who for years served the cause in Chiang Kai-shek's own household.

Reports from behind the Chinese iron curtain say Mme. Sun has been placed under surveillance by her country's new Communist rulers. She is suspected of being involved in an anti-Communist plot.

Before the Nationalist collapse Mme. Sun openly boosted the Communist cause without fear of punishment by the Nationalists. She urged that feudalistic and autocratic Confucian teachings be uprooted from every nook and corner of our life and thought. She rebuked the United States for intervening in Chinese affairs. These and other critical comments were quoted at length in the dispatches of British and American correspondents who had no time for the Chiang regime.

There can be no doubt that Mme. Sun contributed materially to the Communist tri-

umph. As widow of China's George Washington her opinions carried great weight with people of all classes. And as sister of Mme. Chiang she was free to say what she pleased. In fact, Nationalists often cited Mme. Sun as proof that the Chiang government permitted freedom of speech.

When the new peoples government took over China Mme. Sun was appointed one of six deputy chairmen in recognition of her contributions. Yet Communists have an infinite capacity for suspicion. Apparently they have concluded that no one so intimately associated with Chiang Kai-shek's family as is Mme. Sun can ever be fully trusted.

Has Mme. Sun actually changed her mind about the Communists? It is possible, of course. But if we must rely only on Communist news sources the truth may never be known.

A Message From Main Street, U. S. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the people out in Kansas from the district I have the honor to represent, are beginning to do a lot of wondering about this Government's financial policies. From the people who do business and pay their taxes up and down Main Street, and from those who make the Main Streets possible, the farmers, there is coming a chain reaction against this present attitude of our Government.

Harry Hopkins, right-hand man of President Roosevelt, is supposed to have once said, "Go ahead, the people are too dumb to understand."

These people may not know all the implications of the Amerasia case. The names Lattimore, Herrington, Jaffe, may not mean much to them at present.

They may not know that Trygve Lie, the Norwegian Secretary General of the United Nations, has followed the Communist line ever since he has been boss of the United Nations. They may not know that he was appointed to this office at the insistence of Joe Stalin. They may not know that this man, Trygve Lie, is sole boss of 5,000 employees of the United Nations. That he has been flying to Moscow, Paris, and European countries trying to get enough votes to admit Communist China into the United Nations. The above picture may be a little obscure to these people out home, but they do understand in our part of the country this basic idea: That you cannot spend more than you take in. They are worried about their bonds, their life-insurance policies, and their savings accounts. They are beginning to wonder what kind of dollars are going to be used to pay them off at the maturity date.

Mr. Speaker, these people know that money has two important functions—a medium of exchange and a storehouse of value. They know that now their dollars cannot be redeemed in gold; they also know that the Government printing presses are turning out billions in paper